



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,636	02/18/2004	Theodore R. Zeigler	000002-003	9100
44912	7590	03/02/2009		
WRB-IP LLP 1217 KING STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
BARTOSIK, ANTHONY N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3635				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/02/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HARRY@WRB-IP.COM

angie@wrb-ip.com

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/779,636

**Applicant(s)**

ZEIGLER, THEODORE R.

**Examiner**

ANTHONY N. BARTOSIK

**Art Unit**

3635

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anthony Bartosik.(3) Harold Brown.(2) Richard Chilcot.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, and 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Esser et al. (US 5,943,837).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The amended language of claim 1 was discussed, where the Examiner indicated that the current amendments would not define the invention over the prior art. It was suggested that the limitations of claims 15 and 16 be included into independent claims 1 and 30 in order to define the invention from Esser et al. Mr. Brown agreed to discuss the suggested changes with his client and inform the Examiner how they would like to proceed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635